

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	No. CV-F-05-290 REC/DLB
)	
)	ORDER STRIKING "NOTICE OF
Petitioner,)	ACCEPTANCE OF THE COURT'S
)	ORDER RELEASING STEVEN BOOTH
vs.)	FROM CAPTIVITY, DATED
)	OCTOBER 5, 2005 AND NOTICE
)	OF ACCEPTANCE OF THE ORDER
)	REQUIRING FURTHER
V. STEVEN BOOTH and LOUISE)	COMPLIANCE, ON THE
Q. BOOTH,)	UNQUALIFIED SIGNATURE OF
)	ROBERT E. COYLE AS
)	CONSIDERATION FOR ALL PAST,
Respondent.)	PRESENT AND FUTURE CLAIMS OF
)	THE IRS" (Doc. 70)
)	

On October 12, 2005, respondent V. Steven Booth, proceeding in pro per, filed a document captioned "NOTICE OF ACCEPTANCE OF THE COURT'S ORDER RELEASING STEVEN BOOTH FROM CAPTIVITY, DATED OCTOBER 5, 2005. **AND** NOTICE OF ACCEPTANCE OF THE ORDER REQUIRING FURTHER COMPLIANCE, ON THE UNQUALIFIED SIGNATURE OF ROBERT E. COYLE AS CONSIDERATION FOR ALL PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE CLAIMS OF THE IRS." Attached to this document is a copy of the court's

1 Order Releasing Vincent Steven Booth and Requiring Further
2 Compliance signed by the court on October 5, 2005. The document
3 states that V. Steven Booth, as the "authorized agent" for V.
4 Steven Booth

5 accepts the court's order dated October 5,
6 2005; paragraphs 2 through 8 on the
7 unqualified signature of Robert E. Coyle, as
8 surety for all IRS claims past, present and
9 future. The authorized agent will hence
10 forth submit all claims, which are sent to
11 VINCENT STEVEN BOOTH & LOUISE Q. BOOTH aka V.
12 Steven Booth aka V. Steven Booth or any
13 combination therein to Robert E. Coyle, as
14 surety.

15 The court hereby strikes this document and disregards it for
16 all further proceedings in this action. The document is legally
17 invalid, without merit or effect, and constitutes an abuse of
18 process. The undersigned, Robert E. Coyle, is not and never has
19 been a surety for either of the respondents with regard to any
20 claims made against them by the Internal Revenue Service or for
21 any other claims against them made by any other person or entity.
22 Respondent is required to fully comply with the terms of the
23 October 5, 2005 Order. Respondent is warned that his failure to
24 do so may result in the issuance of an order to show cause why
25 respondent should not again be found in civil contempt and
26 incarcerated until he has complied with the terms of the October
5, 2005 Order and the Summons Enforcement Order filed on May 25,
2005.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: October 13, 2005
668554

/s/ Robert E. Coyle
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE